

REMARKS

The Office Action dated June 27, 2007 has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered by the Applicants. In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-23, 28-30, 32-34, 36-38, 40-42, and 44-47 are currently pending, and all previously pending claims have been cancelled. New claims 48-88 have been added to the present application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Previously filed claims 1, 3-23, 28-30, 32-34, 36-38 and 40-42, and 44-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,463,463 Godfrey et al. ("Godfrey") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,785,868 to Raff ("Raff"). Claims 1, 3-23, 28-30, 32-34, 36-38 and 40-42, and 44-47 have been cancelled, and thus, the rejections thereof are moot.

New Claims

Applicants submit that new claims 48-88 are novel and non-obvious over the combination of Godfrey and Raff, for the reasons outlined below.

New independent claim 48 includes, among other features, that the processor performs "maintaining an individual calendar corresponding to the first wireless device of the group, the individual calendar comprising the one or more calendar events and the one or more private calendar events; and providing access to the individual calendar only by the first wireless device of the group." Applicants submit that neither Godfrey nor Raff discloses, teaches, or suggests this element of claim 48, as amended.

Godfrey does not disclose this feature of claim 48, and the Office Action apparently concedes that Godfrey does not contain such disclosure, in discussing previous claim 44 (See Office Action, Par. 39). Rather, the Office Action asserts that disclosure of this feature can be found in Raff. Applicants submit that Raff also does not disclose this feature recited in claim 48. The portions of Raff cited by the Office Action relate to two different embodiments, and neither embodiment contains disclosure, teaching, or suggestion of this feature of claim 48. In

particular, neither embodiment of Raff discloses a shared server or other apparatus that contains and provides or distributes both group (shared) calendar events and private calendar events.

One of the embodiments of Raff, described in part at Col. 11, Lns. 9-46, provides shared calendar information for a number of users from a shared database or server (332). (Col. 9, Lns. 9-31). However, Raff does not disclose that any “private” calendar events or other private information is stored in, or provided by, the shared database or server (332). The disclosure of Raff repeatedly refers to the calendar information stored in and distributed from the shared database (332) as calendar information that is “shared” and accessible and modifiable by a number of different people. (See, e.g., Col. 9, Lns. 11-13, 39-41, and 59-60; Col. 11, Lns. 7-8). Raff discloses that non-shared calendar information (i.e., having the “default” category) is located only within the portable computer (100a) or the user’s non-shared desktop database (326), and that the shared information is obtained from the shared database (332). (Col. 9, Lns. 24-31 and 51-62). This differs from the features of claim 48, which recites that the individual calendar is maintained on the same apparatus as the group calendar, but that the individual calendar is accessible only to the wireless device from which the private calendar events are received. Thus, this embodiment of Raff does not disclose these features of claim 48.

Another of the embodiments of Raff, described in part at Col. 12, Lns. 13-67, and Col. 13, Lns. 1-46, provides shared calendar information for multiple users from a shared desktop database (326). Raff does not disclose that any of the calendar information contained in database (326) is private or non-shared, and in fact, does not disclose or discuss any calendar information being non-shared in this embodiment. With reference to FIG. 15, Raff discloses that the database for each portable computer (100a, 100b, etc.), contains “unfiled” information (560) that is “personal” to the computer (100a) of that particular group member, as well as information (562, 564, 566) that is “personal” to the computers (100b, 100c, 100d) of the other group members. (See also Col. 13, Lns. 8-20). Thus, information personal to all group members is stored on the shared database (326) and is accessible and retrievable by each computer (100a, etc.). Claim 48 recites that the individual calendar, which is accessible only to the wireless device from which the private calendar events are received, are provided by the same apparatus as the group calendar, and Raff does not disclose the shared database (326) providing such

private information. Rather, Raff only discloses the database (326) providing shared information. Applicants note that, although the user of a particular computer (100a) can select to show/hide information corresponding to certain other users, the information for the other users remains accessible to the user's computer (100a) at the option of the user. (Col. 13, Lns. 39-46). Thus, this embodiment of Raff also does not disclose these features of claim 48. (Col. 13, Lns. 59-63).

Accordingly, because neither Godfrey nor Raff discloses, teaches, or suggests at least the above-discussed features of amended claim 48, no prima facie case of obviousness can be established with respect to claim 48. Additionally, no prima facie case of obviousness can be established with respect to dependent claims 49-58 depending therefrom.

New claim 59 includes, among other features, "maintaining an individual calendar corresponding to the first wireless device of the group, the individual calendar comprising the one or more calendar events and the one or more private calendar events; and providing access to the individual calendar only by the first wireless device of the group." This is similar to the feature discussed above with respect to claim 48. Accordingly, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 48, no prima facie case of obviousness can be established with respect to claim 59, or with respect to dependent claims 60-68 depending therefrom.

New independent claim 69 includes, among other features, that the processor performs "accessing an individual calendar maintained on the server and accessible only by the apparatus, the individual calendar comprising the one or more calendar events, the one or more additional calendar events, and the one or more private calendar events." Applicants submit that neither Godfrey nor Raff discloses, teaches, or suggests this element of claim 69, as amended.

As described above with respect to claim 48, neither Godfrey nor Raff discloses a server or other apparatus that provides both a group calendar, accessible by all members of a group, and an individual calendar, accessible by only one member of the group. Thus, the references also do not disclose an apparatus configured for accessing a server to obtain such an individual calendar. Accordingly, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 48, no prima facie

case of obviousness can be established with respect to claim 69, or with respect to dependent claims 70-75 depending therefrom.

New claim 76 includes, among other features, “accessing an individual calendar maintained on the server and accessible only by one of the plurality of wireless devices, the individual calendar comprising the one or more calendar events, the one or more additional calendar events, and the one or more private calendar events.” This is similar to the feature discussed above with respect to claim 69. Accordingly, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 48, no prima facie case of obviousness can be established with respect to claim 76, or with respect to dependent claims 77-82 depending therefrom.

New claim 83 includes, among other features, that the processor performs “providing access to each group calendar event by all of the plurality of wireless devices of the group; and providing access to each private calendar event only by the wireless device from which the private calendar event was received.” As described above with respect to claim 48, neither Raff nor Godfrey discloses an apparatus that contains both group calendar events and private calendar events, providing access to the group calendar events by all wireless devices of a group, and providing access to each of the private calendar events only by a specific wireless device. Accordingly, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 48, no prima facie case of obviousness can be established with respect to claim 83, or with respect to dependent claims 84-85 depending therefrom.


New claim 86 includes, among other features, that the processor performs “providing access to each group calendar event by all of the plurality of wireless devices of the group; and providing access to each private calendar event only by the wireless device from which the private calendar event was received.” This is similar to the feature discussed above with respect to claim 83. Accordingly, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 83, no prima facie case of obviousness can be established with respect to claim 86, or with respect to dependent claims 87-88 depending therefrom.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should it be deemed necessary to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 24, 2007

By: 
Gregory G. Schlenz
Registration No. 55,597
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive,
Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001

1244331